

Mr. Roger Feinman
Lanzone & Kramer
26 Broadway
New York, N.Y. 10004

9/14/88

Dear Roger,

Walking to our mailbox and back is about my limit and it always hurts on the way back if not before then. This morning there was more than the considerable amount of junk mail and as I skimmed the envelopes on the way back, which, with a straight paved lane I can do safely, I wondered about the envelope of a firm of which I'd never heard and its thickness. I assumed it was a law firm and not knowing any reason why one should write me I thought almost immediately it was you. And I was pleased, very pleased, on getting back into the house to find I was correct. And as sorry to hear that Sylvia health is not good. I hope whatever it is can be treated. Please tell her that one who has been on borrowed time more than a decade - I had the first of many thromboses before we met - hopes she is at least as fortunate.

Before I forget, I've mislaid the Dallas doctors' press conference that you got from the LBJ library and would appreciate a copy if it is not too much trouble. I may have a good use for it soon.

I've forgotten what I wrote Sylvia, except in general terms. I can recall meeting Richter only twice, once at the Archives when I drove him and NYTimes' Apple shack to their offices and once when he visited us at our unfinished home at Hyattstown, where we had the chicken farm. We left there 21 years ago the first of next month. Neither meeting was in any way unfriendly. So, I was quite surprised to hear from Jim Cesar that when Richter had told him that he was doing this thing for Nova and was most interested in the scientific evidence and Jim told him he should see me, as Jim told me Richter's response was to say that he would not. Richter then asked him where he could get a copy of Post Mortem, Jim told him the same thing and got the same response. It means nothing to me personally but I had to wonder about this and how to account for it. It is not, to say the least, a journalist's attitude.

Couple of days ago Ted Gandolfo phoned me. Among other things he told me that Richter had asked him for some of his tapes. I took this to mean videotapes of some of Ted's cable shows but it could have meant other tapes. Whatever it meant, the obvious, whether or not justified and correct conclusion, is that Richter intends using Gandolfo as a sample of critics. I hope I'm wrong.

Dave Wrone tried to speak to the production staff at Nova on this and was on several occasions rebuffed. I wrote the woman whose name he gave me and I got not even an acknowledgement. My letter was a caution against Nova and PBS making serious errors that could embarrass them.

Let me confess my own attitude first. I have these some 60 file cabinets of stuff I got under FOIA, about 2/3 of the total, and all the other work I've done, all the records of all the FOIA litigation, much of which related to the things Richter says interest him most, and neither he nor anyone on the show wants access to any of it. Separately I assure you that there is what is quite significant that has never been used in this material, excellent for a show of that description. My books can be obtained only from me, unless borrowed, and such a show doesn't want to see them?

How can I account for Richter's attitude and its utter unprofessionalism? Lifton or someone like him, if there is such, is obvious. And, from what I learned, not an unreasonable suspicion. Lifton told someone I know and trust that as of some time ago Richter had spent three hours with him.

As you may or may not have known, Lifton and Hoch are close and Hoch swallowed Lifton's baggage and exclaimed "Manna!" Now it happens that when Guinn testified before HUAC I was able to plant a question to be asked outside the hearing room and it was

asked and Lifton was there with a tape recorder, and monopolizing the whole thing to try to advance his own agenda, and got my question and the answer on tape. Hoch sent me a dub some years ago. I loaned it to Henry Guinn, who claims it is mislaid. I told him Hoch could provide a dub and he then told me that Hoch says he doesn't have that tape. This is the first time I've known Hoch not to be truthful. I wrote him, several months ago, and he's not responded. The only explanation I find reasonable is that Lifton has asked him not to let me have it.

I have a dependable source on these next two things. One is that when Richter interviewed Dr. Shaw in Dallas he was almost exclusively interested in "the second casket theory," Shaw's words second-hand to me. Another is that when, as I recall, Richter was out there to see Lifton (and it may have been at another time) he spent quite some time with Guinn.

I have Guinn's report to HUAC and it is high-quality prostitution of science. Knowing that he could not validate the specimens he was given and knowing that they did not fit their official descriptions, he went ahead and tested them and proceeded on the unscientific and unprofessional assumption that they were authentic.

I can make out a case I think you might enjoy using in what is not, a courtroom, that the specimens all came from the base of 399. (And this is in the court records Richter doesn't want to see here, by the way, under oath yet and by the FBI.) Remember, I did not say prove. I said make out a case.

Anyway, do I need more to suspect that Richter is up to something and to believe that it is not good and include's Lifton's fabrications as basic in whatever he is doing? Or without this to suspect him?

Most of the people who have, as all do, unsupervised access to my files, are those I disagree with. Even some I regard as awful, like Spotlight and Carto's fascists. Today some of the several shows working on the mafiadidn't nonsense are coming and I've mailed stuff to another such cabal. I am and have been diligently surrogate for the people on this. I don't think anyone ever told Richter anything else. Hell, the National Enquirer is coming next week. Oddly, they may wind up being more responsible than the Jackie Anderson Hollywood gang and Jonathan Kwitny's people, the two mafia-bound above. Perhaps also, Nova, and what a switch that would be!

The WashPost finally did use an edited version of the AP story you sent me. The Post edited the understated Kevin Walsh stuff out but the Moonie paper left it in! And the truth is, as Kevin should have known, that it was not a mere oversight that the report wasn't sent to Rodino. It was deliberate. DJ was always in touch with critics and did not forget the thing at all. They kept promising, including as of the approximate date of their Rodino letter, that it would be within a few weeks. The FOIA request ~~xxxx~~ compelled the lying letter to Rodino. I've been intending to write him for the record and soon will. Gandalfo, for example, was regularly in touch with Jeffry whose last name I've forgotten on this and Ted kept me informed.

Of what I know is coming for the anniversary, two things ought be good. I've seen the thesis-documentary by a Univ. Md. master's candidate and it is good. I think that Nigel Turner's for British ITV will be good, too. I've given him some good things and put him on to others he was quite pleased with.

Kwitny seems to be quite taken with Scheim's book. I've not looked at it in the belief that it is impossible. So why waste money on it?

We finally got an inexpensive VCR, with incomprehensible instructions. Before the anniversary I'm sure that someone who can go past the instructions will be here and set the four UHF channels for me so I'll be able to tape that Nova. If not I can get friends to do the taping for me on their sets. I'd also like to see a transcript as soon as possible. If you know anyone who will get a promo copy I'd appreciate it. I may or may not be asked but I'd like to be in a position to respond if I am asked.

If in advance I might be able to generate some interest if criticism is warrantd.

Did your computer service provide the Houston Chronicle story of about two weeks ago, picked up by the wire services, on the Zapruder commercialization of the film? Reporter was Jerry Urban. Henry Zapruder told the graduate student that he'd sue if the kid didn't cough up \$30,000. He and I are going to sue Zapruder as soon as Jim can get the time. Please keep this confidential until it happens, except for telling Sylvia. I've been supposed to get authorization in writing from him to make slides from the original and for years he has been stalling. This was agreed to in my C.B. 78-~~0322~~ 0322. as of when we spoke last, Jim's thinking was not to use FOIA. Boy can I file an affidavit on the public need and the record to now! In simplest terms, the Z film, used properly rather than misued as propaganda to buttress an untenable theory, destroys that theory. And, incidentally, a book that is due soon.

Gandolfo told me also that Garrison has a book recently retitled to "Coup d'Etat" with something about the CIA in its subtitle, due soon. Says he's getting a couple of advance copies and will send me one.

In retrospect, I'm not unhappy a bit that Richter is such a stinker because I'd have trusted him and given him whatever he wanted, might even have volunteered what he didn't ask for because it is for Nova, which has done some fine things.

By the way, if you recall, when you saw Richter's memos on his interview of critics was there anything in that to explain his current unprofessionalism? about me?

I hope your work is satisfying and challenging and interesting.

Thanks and best wishes,

Harold